

## REMARKS

Claims 23-44 are pending in this application. By this Response, claims 23, 37 and 44 have been amended. Attached hereto is a complete listing of all the pending claims.

### **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Pending claims 23-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,848,373 ("DeLorme"). As discussed below, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

#### **A. The Law of Anticipation and Enabling Prior Art References**

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. M.P.E.P. § 2131. The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Id.*

However, Applicant submits that amended independent claims 23, 37 and 44 have elements that cannot be found, either expressly or inherently, in DeLorme.

For example, both independent claims 23 and 44 recite, in part:

"reducing a size of the packets by eliminating at least one data point from at least one display element by applying an angle comparison between an adjacent display element, wherein the at least one data point is eliminated if an angle between the at least one display element and the adjacent display element is about 180°"

DeLorme has no teaching or suggestion of reducing packet sizes as recited in amended claim 23. Instead, DeLorme teaches "decluttering options" that are:

"determined on a quantitative basis by limiting the length of alphanumerical text output, or the ratio of active versus inactive pixels on the screen, or the overall quantity of CAMLS loc/objects allowed on the screen, or putting caps on the size of CAMLS display lists or buffers" (col. 50, lines 24-34).

Thus, DeLorme fails to anticipate amended claims 23 and 44, as DeLorme contains no teaching or suggestion of using angle comparisons between display elements.

Similarly, Applicant submits that amended independent claim 37 has elements that cannot be found, either expressly or inherently, in DeLorme.

For example, independent claim 37 recites, in part: “. . . caching at least one packet until an amount of computer storage space is filled, and determining which packets should be replaced.”

DeLorme contains no teaching or suggestion of this claim element. Instead, DeLorme simply teaches “a new multimedia system for correlation and coordination of spatially related information between diverse media such as transitory digital electronic displays or other computer outputs and graphics, text, fixed media presentations such as a printed sheet media including printed maps” (col. 3, lines 56-61).

DeLorme does not teach caching and replacing packets as recited in amended independent claim 37.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that DeLorme cannot anticipate any of amended independent claims 23, 37 and 44. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the above-described amendments and the accompanying response have traversed the rejection of independent claims 23, 37 and 44. As claims 24-36 and 38-43 depend from and further limit and define the invention as recited in amended independent claims 23 and 37, respectively, the dependent claims are also patentably distinct from the art being considered as the arguments above with respect to the amended independent claims apply to the dependent claims as well.

M.P.E.P. § 2143.03.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

**Conclusion**

Applicant believes that this Response has addressed all items in the Office Action and now places the application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance of claims 23-44 at an early date is solicited. No additional fee is believed due with this response, beyond the three-month extension of time fee. However, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any necessary additional fee required to our Deposit Account No. 50-2298, in the name of Luce, Forward, Hamilton & Scripps LLP. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

9.15.03  
Date

  
Peter R. Martinez  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 42,845

c/o            LUCE, FORWARD, HAMILTON  
                  & SCRIPPS LLP  
                  11988 El Camino Real, Ste. 200  
                  San Diego, California 92130  
                  Telephone No.: (858) 720-6300